20¢ DECEMBER 19, 1949

New Republic

THE SUPREME COURT IS STANDING PAT

By FRED RODELL

A PLAN FOR PENSIONS

AN EDITORIAL

TITO DEFENDS HIS REGIME

By FRANK GERVASI

NOTABLE BOOKS OF 1949

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHRISTMAS BARGAINS – 1949

▸ For the first time in six years we are able to offer our readers a choice of book and magazine selections for Christmas gifts at reduced prices.

▸ First, gifts of the *New Republic* to friends: in these confused and dangerous times, it is a bold and confident voice. Your friends will be reminded of your thoughtfulness every week during the coming year, and the *New Republic* will be indebted to you for your aid in helping maintain a strong liberal publication.

▸ As in former years, we may again offer tempting bargains of books and other magazines jointly with a subscription to the *New Republic*. A Christmas card, if requested, will be sent in your name to the recipients of gift subscriptions. Books and magazines may be sent to separate addresses as provided for in the order form below. *Your own subscription may be included* in these money-saving offers. To avoid last-minute Christmas delays in the mails, please act NOW.

Bargains in subscriptions to the New Republic–$11 or $16

▸ Two one-year subscriptions, or one two-year subscription for $11; three one-year subscriptions for $16. Your own subscription may be included no matter when it expires. A Christmas card, in your name, will be sent to each recipient of a subscription.

Bargains in combination with other magazines–$8.50 to $12.50

▸ One year of the *New Republic, Harper's* and *Atlantic Monthly* (reg. $17.50)–all three for $12.50 (a saving of $5). Or *Harper's* with the *New Republic* for $8.50 (you save $3), or *Atlantic* with the *New Republic* for $9.50 (saving $3).

Bargains with Modern Library Books

▸ The *New Republic* for one year and any ONE of these Modern Library books (Random House, regularly $1.25) for $6.75. Postage is prepaid. The book and the magazines may be mailed to one or to separate addresses.

Twentieth Century American Poetry, selected by Conrad Aiken
The Short Bible, edited by Goodspeed and Smith
Wuthering Heights, by Emily Brontë
Walden and Other Writings, by Henry David Thoreau
Lord Jim, by Joseph Conrad
Eminent Victorians, by Lytton Strachey
Crime and Punishment, by Fyodor Dostoyevsky
Human Nature and Conduct, by John Dewey
Moby Dick, by Herman Melville
A Bell for Adano, by John Hersey
The Philosophy of Plato, edited by Irwin Edman
Of Human Bondage, by W. Somerset Maugham
Vanity Fair, by William M. Thackeray
Life with Father, by Clarence Day
Green Mansions, by W. H. Hudson

After making your selections, please clip, fill out and mail the order form below.

The New Republic • 40 East 49 Street • New York 17

For the enclosed _____ please send the *New Republic* to

	and send to	and send to
Name		
Street		
City		
State		

12/19/49

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR DEC. 19, 1949

5 A Plan for Pensions: An Editorial
7 The Week:
7 The Fulton Lewis Scare
7 Next Case
8 Alvin Johnson at 75
8 Equality in Housing
8 Herblock Cartoon
9 More Monopoly Evidence
9 The Lobby Against Co-ops
9 Outside America
11 The Supreme Court Is Standing Pat by Fred Rodell
14 A Visit to Franco's Spain by Philip Singer and Gilbert Cranberg
15 The Defense of the Tito Regime by Frank Gervasi
17 Harold L. Ickes
18 Books:
18 From Depressions to Schnorkels by James R. Newman
19 Notable Books of 1949
20 Theatre
22 Radio and Television
23 Movies

EDITOR: Michael Straight

EDITORIAL DIRECTOR: Bruce Bliven

PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane

MANAGING EDITOR: Jack Weeks

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Malcolm Cowley, John Farrelly, Harold L. Ickes, Joseph P. Lash, Max Lerner, James R. Newman, Gus Tyler

FOREIGN AFFAIRS EDITOR: Percy Winner

WASHINGTON BUREAU: Helen Fuller, (Political Editor), Jean Begeman

DEPARTMENTS: Robert Hatch (Chief), Cecil Smith (Music), Saul Carson (Radio and Television), Harold Clurman (Theatre), Lincoln Kirstein (Fine Arts)

COPY EDITING: Elizabeth Huling (Chief), Ruth Tarcov

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1949, IN THE U. S. A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N.Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY 20¢; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50. PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

WASHINGTON WIRE

WHAT A CROSS between the Republican elephant and the Dixiecrat donkey would be like we have no idea, but handsome John Bricker (R, Ohio) wants to produce the critter. Senator Bricker is generally noted in Washington more for looks than brains, and in this instance he seems to have blurted out a secret wish of fellow Republicans which they would have preferred to leave unexpressed. Bricker says he would even be prepared to have the name "Republican" disappear if this great union could be consummated.

Those interested in political genetics urge on the match. The liberal ADA approves the Bricker plan and says, "Northern men of Southern principles should team up with the South." What it means, of course, is that the union should be open and aboveboard. Heretofore there has been a covert alliance in Congress that has often been able to block Truman legislation. This is apt to go on because it is more effective operating in secret. A frank acknowledgement that the union exists would arouse exactly the popular revulsion its participants most fear. Sorry, John.

We have a little more information on four major developments of foreign policy. All the denials of an intention to set up a German "army" to the contrary, the wind blows in that direction and some sort of preliminary German force will be established as soon as France has had more time to adjust itself to the disagreeable idea. . . . In discussions with Britain over the atom bomb, America is taking the position that the UK should not duplicate the enormously expensive facilities for making the bomb and that, instead, our stockpile will be placed at her disposal in case of necessity. . . . Regarding Spain, the desire of the American military for access to her landing fields is as strong as ever and won't be quenched; ideology has little to do with it. . . . Finally, China: everything seems set for the British to recognize the Communist government before very long, followed by a growing demand by American commercial interests for US recognition; this should come about, we guess, within six to 12 months after the British action.

Last week was "Fulton Lewis Week" in Washington. It was generally observed by the newspapers over the nation. Former Air Force Major Jordan had some sensational wartime charges about Harry Hopkins, Russia, and the atomic bomb which he had been peddling around. The *Life-Time* outfit looked them over, held its nose, and rejected them. That made Jordan think of Lewis. Lewis took the stuff, went on the air with Jordan denouncing Hopkins; then a few days later Lewis on his own account dragged in the name of Henry Wallace.

The stories were unsubstantiated, conflicting, and inherently improbable. Much would hinge on the testimony of ex-Manhattan Project chief Leslie R. Groves. General Groves was on a spot. He has heretofore been the darling of Lewis and the House Un-American Activities Committee. At a 1948 executive session of this committee he apparently joined with members in canvassing the idea of pinning something on Wallace. Now he had to testify in public, under oath. To add to his difficulties, his Connecticut neighbor, Senator Brian McMahon, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, called him in advance and, in effect, said: "No funny business! Stick to facts before the committee or I'll summon you over here and get the real lowdown."

Groves resents civilian control of the A-bomb and harbors political am-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bitions. But in this case he had to exonerate Hopkins and Wallace, doing so, however, with as much innuendo and as many significant winks and nods as he could summon. He is not half so good at this sort of thing, however, as Lewis, who kept right on, though his story was blowing up in his face.

The current series by able Charles Van Devander in the New York *Post* on Fulton Lewis Jr. is the best we have seen. Right through the war Lewis ridiculed and attacked controls and rationing. At the height of the conflict, in 1944, he told his big following that it would be "perfectly safe to remove all price ceilings and let prices simmer down [!] to their own level." Goebbels frequently rebroadcast Lewis. The Writers War Board termed his radio period "a shocking isolationist, intolerant and devisive program." Cornell Professor Chester has used Lewis as a case history of "irresponsibility on the air" (*Public Opinion Quarterly*, Spring, 1949). He is carried on 440 Mutual stations, the network in which Colonel McCormick has an interest. Lewis personally is big, bounding, good-looking, a complete extrovert, as innocent of guilt as a collie. Undoubtedly he is one of the most powerful figures in Washington. He coöperates so closely with Republicans that there is always a dispute here whether Lewis works for the GOP National Committee or the committee works for him.

Notes. Able, liberal Representative Mike Monroney (D, Okla.) may contest the Senate seat of 74-year-old Elmer Thomas, who is boycotting Sweden this winter. . . . George Kennan quits the State Department partly for salary reasons, partly because Marshall installed him to do high-power thinking and now Dean Acheson is doing much of his own. . . . Doctors who don't pay $25 to the AMA will be thrown out; with a lobby expenditure of $1,225,000 in the first nine months of '49, this group already heads all others.

Washington T. R. B.

CORRESPONDENCE

Credit Where Credit Is Due

SIR: As one of his last acts in office, former Secretary of Interior Krug reversed himself and created the first reservations for Alaska Indians. The legislation previously proposed, to confiscate the Indians' land and turn it over to the pulp monopolies, now seems to be dead. . . .

The Indians themselves carried the main burden of the struggle, but on at least two occasions their white friends saved the day. The first was in late 1946 when the American Civil Liberties Union financed a trip to Alaska for Mrs. Ruth Bronson. This resulted in the present fighting alliance between the Alaska Native Brotherhood and the National Congress of American Indians.

The second occasion was early this year when Krug was about to sell his confiscation law to the President and Congress. Many others helped, but former Secretary Ickes' characteristically scorching exposure (the *NR*, May 9) was, in my opinion, what finally turned the tide against it.

We have received help from William Green, the American Association on Indian Affairs, and many others. . . . But I want you to know that the *New Republic's* assistance was of very special significance.

JAMES E. CURRY, Attorney for the National Congress of American Indians and the Alaska Native Brotherhood

Washington, D. C.

Brannan Plan and Farm Bureau

SIR: Mr. Mezerik's article (the *NR*, November 28) on the Brannan Plan is, for the most part, a good and useful job. I would, however, draw your attention to two things:

1. The Grange as well as the Farm Bureau has officially gone on record as opposed to the Plan.

2. Your author repeats . . . the inaccurate statement that the Farm Bureau controls the Extension Service. There are now only eight states where by action of state legislatures there is a tie between the Farm Bureau and the Extension Service of the state college of agriculture. Not all of these states belong to the American Farm Bureau Federation. . . . In a number of states which require farm organizations' requests or sponsorship before counties can appropriate the local share of the funds, the Grange and the Farmers Union are used as often as the Bureau.

A joint committee of the Department of Agriculture and the Land Grant College Association last year urged that in the few states where the tie still exists, it be sundered. Any examination of the various Extension programs in the 48 states and of the platform of the Farm Bureau would show how unjust the sweeping charge of your author is to this internationally acclaimed agency with its distinguished record of service.

EDMUND DE S. BRUNNER

New York City

SIR: On November 26, two days after the appearance of my article, the National Grange, meeting in Sacramento, California, rejected by resolution the Brannan Plan. The New York *Times's* report of the meeting carried this significant statement: "The Brannan Plan held center stage during the entire convention." "Center stage" means that the delegates had much to say and will say it again. In fact, several state Grange organizations are on record in favor of the Brannan Plan.

That the Farm Bureau has great influence in the Extension Service is beyond argument. The Bureau deserves great credit for having been wise enough and quick enough in earlier years to have seized the opportunity of helping to form the Service. Though ties are legally less strong than before, its influence remains constant and vigorous.

In states where the Farmers Union and the Grange are the strongest farm organizations, they logically have forced themselves into the pattern of deciding how appropriations are doled out. This is, however, beyond the point of my article. I was writing about the impact of the Brannan Plan on rank-and-file farmers and interpreting it in terms of its effects on city workers.

New York City A. G. MEZERIK

Hope for the GOP

SIR: Your charts picturing the individual voting records of members of the House and Senate on the major issues of the year have become invaluable to the discriminating citizen.

It seems deplorable that the Republican Party, as you point out and as your charts substantiate, seems to be committed to a policy of reaction on the domestic front. There is no lack of talent in its ranks. Individual Republicans like Senator Morse and Representative Javits, your tabulation shows, have a perfect voting record by progressive standards. Their guidance could furnish excellent leadership to a rejuvenated opposition party. . . .

New York City ROBERT HAMLISCH

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOLUME 121, NUMBER 25, ISSUE 1829, NEW YORK CITY, DECEMBER 19, 1949 **New Republic**

A PLAN FOR PENSIONS

SUBSTANTIAL FEDERAL PENSIONS seem a political certainty in the near future. In fact, after 10 years without any progress in social security, the line forming behind immediate-pensions-for-all is growing so fast that the danger now may be that, finally moved to action, we shall act unwisely. Business, seeking to shift the burden of industrial pensions from employers to government; politicians, sensing the rising clamor for security in old age; and organized old people, sick of living on charity, will all be converging on Congress next year. The dramatic achievement of the unions in winning $100-a-month old-age guarantees from the steel, auto and mining industries has excited such a general desire for similar security that it is no longer a question whether we shall have adequate pensions, but what kind they shall be.

A small proportion of American industries have moved to relieve the mounting pressure through private pension plans of various kinds. These plans blossomed in greatest numbers during the war years when the excess-profits tax made it possible to provide pensions for an outlay of 15 to 20 cents on the dollar, the government footing the rest of the bill. In the last seven years, private pension arrangements multiplied about seven times, but still only 13,000 of the 490,000 United States corporations have such plans in operation today.

The pressure has not by any means been entirely relieved. The percentage of our population over 65 rose from three percent in 1850 to seven percent in 1940, and is expected to reach 10 percent by 1970. The meager benefits this group was drawing from the social-security program in 1938 have not begun to keep pace with inflation; while the cost of living is up about 70 percent since 1940, federal old-age-insurance benefits have increased only $2.60 per month, to an average of $25.60, leaving buying power cut about 35 percent. Payments to these aged citizens are averaging only 73 cents per day at the present time. Even those old people not eligible for insurance from payroll levies have fared better. Old-age assistance grants, paid only to the poverty-stricken, have risen from an average of $20.26 per month in 1940 to $43.60, which means a 40-percent increase in real purchasing power and gives these charity cases a better break than those who have left their jobs in industry because of old age.

This year only 1,600,000 of the 11 million Americans over 65 will receive old-age-insurance benefits from the federal government. To be eligible, a man or woman must have had six full years of work in "covered" employment, and not more than three out of five civilian jobs are in the "covered" class. In addition, no payment is made in any month when the pensioner earns more than $14.99 by his own labor. The maximum benefit for a man retiring at the end of this year who has earned $3,000 or more every year since the Social Security Act has been in operation will be $44.80 per month. Actual payments now are greatly below this, since few workers have earned $250 a month regularly since 1937.

The system established by the Social Security Act of 1935 consisted of contributory insurance based on the level of past earnings, and a grant-in-aid program providing federal funds to the states for charity cases. This latter program is entirely local, except for minimum standards set by the federal government. These state programs vary widely, the number receiving assistance last year ranging from 79 percent of all Louisianans over 65 to less than five percent of the aged in the District of Columbia. But the charity benefits under the grant-in-aid system have proved so much more adjustable to the cost of living that, contrary to the intention of the original Act, the old-age-assistance program has become the major element. While the rest of the world has been moving forward with social security along insurance lines, the United States has tended to go back to the charity principle. The resentment of our "senior citizens" over this fact is natural and their efforts to force the elimination of the charity concept are fully justified.

As our retired senior citizens have fallen behind the economic parade, they have become a prime target for local demagogues. Aspiring swindlers and budding politicians alike have studied the political lessons learned by the ham-and-eggers and similar movements of the early thirties, and are whipping up the oldsters when aging spirits lag. Most of this activity is for flat

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pensions, regardless of previous rate of earnings. The pressure is strongest in agricultural states where old people have been convinced that they have no stake in the present social-security system. In California, Florida, Louisiana, Oklahoma and Washington, in particular, the old folks are a powerful political force today. When the last session of Congress adjourned, the Townsend Plan bill was only 39 signatures short of the 218 required to bring it to the floor. Senator Taft has declared that immediately on reconvening, the Senate must study the pension question seriously.

"If a steelworker and a miner are to receive [$100 a month after 65] why not a molder or a waiter?" Senator Taft asks.

Why not, indeed? The question is how best to advance to at least that stage as rapidly as possible.

Continuation of the present trend to disproportionate benefits for industrial workers in our largest corporations is certainly not the way. Even if it means smaller immediate pensions for all than labor could win for itself independently in the concentrated industries, labor will be better off in the long run to work for a national retirement system that will equally protect the farmers, the independent workers and those who are already out of the productive class.

A flat government pension system which disregards previous levels of earnings is not the way either. To substitute such a plan for the present insurance system would be to make security a permanent political football.

The unions have made a fine contribution in the recent fights for industrial pensions, insisting on talking about income as lifetime earnings. Having progressed from hourly to weekly to annual wage goals, the unions are taking the logical next step in aiming now for security of lifetime earning power. That is the context in which pensions should be considered. Basically, the way to high pensions is through high earnings. For the best results, in terms of a full-employment economy, pensions should be related more closely to productivity than to any other criteria.

Pending amendments to the Social Security Act, which were passed by the House in the first session of this Congress, follow these principles and when adopted will improve considerably the present wretched state of affairs. Even with the extensions provided for in HR 6000, however, the vast majority of needy aged would not receive pension insurance as their right and would still have to rely on charity from the assistance program. We believe it is now practical to insist on a far more sweeping plan.

We suggest that:

1. The present social-security system be extended to cover *all* employed persons, including farmers and independent workers earning $400 or more a year, and all those who have reached the age of 65.

2. All men at age 65 and all women at age 60 be made eligible for a minimum retirement benefit of $40 a month. Those who have earned wages in "covered" employment in the past would receive, in addition, 15 percent of their average monthly wage in the highest five years, up to a maximum of $400, plus one percent for each year in which they were employed.

3. Those over 70 would receive these benefits whether they are working or not; those under 70 would receive no benefits if they are earning more than $74 a month.

4. Reductions to be made in the benefits of those who have not been more or less continuously employed —earning wages in roughly three-fourths of the years between the passage of the new law and the age of retirement.

5. Benefits to be tied to the cost of living to protect those dependent on them against depreciation of their dollars. A subsidiary benefit or bonus to be paid whenever the index of consumer prices increases more than a stated percent, perhaps five points in the scale. (When prices decline, the bonuses would be stopped.)

6. All permanently and totally disabled persons should receive the same amounts under the same general conditions applying to those over 65.

7. The employer, the employee and the government would share in the cost. The employer and employee should contribute equally to the retirement fund on the first $4,800 of compensation, and the rate of both contributions should be stepped up gradually to the point where they would cover the cost of the plan. Government contribution, financed by general taxation, should make up the deficit for those now under the program who will contribute to it over less than a lifetime and those already of retirement age. Government contribution, if brought in only when needed, probably would not be required for 10 to 15 years. It is practically impossible, therefore, to measure the dollar cost at that time, since it will depend largely on the size of the national product we shall have attained by then, on the tendency to remain employed of the perhaps 18 million old people we shall have at that time, and the pattern of wages. Eventually, the most intrepid statisticians venture, the government's share would amount to about one-half of the yearly cost of the program.

These proposals would mean immediate benefits to all retired persons of from $50 for a single individual to $149.75 for a man and his wife. In five years, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maximum for the single person would be $130.90 and for the aged couple, $180.90. After 30 years, these benefits would reach $143 for a single man, and $193 for a couple, in the average $3,000 salary range.

This is no inexpensive undertaking. Using simple multiplication, Senator Taft estimated that $100 pensions for all over 65 would cost the government $12 billion a year. Some of his assumptions with regard to cost are no doubt wrong, but his guess is probably in the general neighborhood of the sum that would be involved. Assuming that our gross national product will rise by 75 to 100 percent above the present figure in the next 25 years, this would not be too heavy an obligation to assume.

Even were economists to determine that the cost of a full-scale retirement plan was beyond our means at the moment, however, the matter could not be dropped there. The old people now left outside our social-insurance system will continue their pressure for retirement rights, not charity, until they receive them. As the gap in comparative security for their families continues to widen between industrial workers and farmers, pressure will keep on mounting. The American government is going to have to assume responsibility for security in old age. We can proceed to do so in a way that is geared to assuring full employment by increasing our consumption and production annually—or we can wait until an unworkable scheme is thrust upon us.

THE WEEK

THE FULTON LEWIS SCARE

Despite desperate—and skillful—efforts to conceal that fact, the great Russian spy scare of Fulton Lewis Jr. has blown up in his face, the worst disaster in his whole public career. He and his "witness," the excitable and credulous G. Racey Jordan, said between them that Harry Hopkins sent uranium to Russia in 1943, overruling Lieutenant General Leslie R. Groves, in charge of the atomic-bomb project for the Army; that Vice President Henry Wallace also intervened to get the uranium shipped; and that an attempt was made to send planes containing radar to Russia.

This set of charges turns out to be composed in about equal parts of falsehood and of misinterpretation of fact. Harry Hopkins is dead and cannot defend himself; but General Groves denies the story, both as to Hopkins and as to Wallace. Wallace also denies it, and has demanded of the Un-American Activities Committee the right to be heard in his own defense—a right not yet granted him as we go to press.

It turns out that three-quarters of a ton of non-fissionable uranium derivatives was sent to Russia in a routine way, partly because to withhold it might have given the Russians an important clue to our efforts to make a bomb—efforts which had not yet succeeded. That the Russians, some time later, were doing their best to steal American atom-bomb secrets was amply proved by the Canadian spy trials; but there is no reason to believe the outrageous suggestion that they were helped in the slightest degree by Hopkins or Wallace.

As for the radar, only a few months later the US Army was officially training the Russians in its use, with American equipment. What Fulton Lewis Jr. and a lot of other people seem to forget is that in 1943 the US and Russia were fighting as allies against Germany. If former Major Jordan did what he claims, and removed radar from planes bound for Russia, he thereby weakened the military effort of an American ally, and perhaps lengthened the war and sacrificed the lives of American soldiers who were facing German bullets, far from the safety of Great Falls, Montana. Jordan's action, if known in wartime, could have subjected him to court-martial.

We don't know Jordan's motive in boasting of what he did, but we are well aware of the motives of Fulton Lewis Jr. His wild charges were part of his campaign over many years to smear in every way possible the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and everybody not in accord with the most reactionary political beliefs.

NEXT CASE

The man who set himself up as a super-judge of who is and who is not a "good American" has been found guilty of fraud against the government. The sentence which the court handed J. Parnell Thomas (R, N. J.) —six to 18 months in jail and a $10,000 fine—is light compared to the punishment he handed out as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. And before and during his brief trial, Thomas received greater consideration than he ever gave a "hostile" witness who appeared before his committee.

The government's case was not based on the contents of a letter from a crackpot or a disgruntled government official or an ex-Communist seeking publicity. US District Attorney George Morris Fay traced kickbacks of salaries to Thomas from three women carried on his office payroll. The amount received by Thomas in kickbacks was $8,800, peanuts to big pork-barrel politicians.

Now that the great apostle of "Americanism" has been confirmed as a cheap thief, the Department of Jus-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tice can concentrate on another case that has been pending for more than a year. Complaints have been filed with the Justice Department, charging Representative Alvin O'Konski (R, Wis.) with kickback activities not unlike Thomas'.

In a letter it addressed to Attorney General J. Howard McGrath last week, the Madison *Capital Times* cited the following charges lodged with the Justice Department by several attorneys in Wisconsin:

¶ That O'Konski had at least two employees of his Hurley (Wis.) newspaper on his Congressional secretarial payroll, and had an arrangement whereby these employees kicked back part of their money into the funds of O'Konski's newspaper business.

¶ That O'Konski used federal government money to help pay for the Montreal *River Miner,* a weekly newspaper, which O'Konski purchased in 1940 from Martin Vickers. O'Konski, it is said, arranged this by placing Vickers on the government payroll as one of his Congressional secretaries. (O'Konski admitted in a signed statement to Tax Auditor Lundberg that "Martin Vickers did not have any duties as a Congressional secretary.")

The Wisconsin Department of Taxation, in recent proceedings which forced O'Konski to pay taxes on income which he failed to report, charged that he had benefited personally from the Congressional payroll juggling he carried on. The Department's brief said: "By reason of his position as Congressman, therefore, [O'Konski] derived an economic gain over and above his Congressional salary in the amount of $1,935 in 1943 and $1,003 in 1944. . . ."

"Such stuff as dreams are made on"

ALVIN JOHNSON AT 75

A few weeks ago, John Dewey's ninetieth birthday was celebrated by most of the civilized world. Of all the tributes paid him, he preferred, so he said, that of Alvin Johnson (printed in the *NR,* October 31). Now Dr. Johnson is himself in for a birthday celebration, his seventy-fifth, on December 18.

Though he is best known for his service as an editor of this magazine, and as director for many years of the New School for Social Research, Dr. Johnson's net has been widely cast. He taught at Bryn Mawr, Columbia, Nebraska, Texas, Chicago, Stanford, Cornell and Yale; worked on three encyclopedias, and was largely responsible for one of them, the brilliant *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*; was active in the New York State Committee against Discrimination in Employment; wrote eight books, and found time for a richly variegated private life with family and friends. For years, his short, lucid editorials in the *New School Bulletin* were treasured by aficionados of good thinking and good prose.

In his letter to John Dewey, Dr. Johnson referred to that great man as the latest of the Greek philosophers; and the reference is also valid of himself. One can think of only a few Americans today who would have been at home in the Athens of Phidias, Anaxagoras, Socrates and Pericles; Alvin Johnson is high on that small list.

EQUALITY IN HOUSING

The Administration has finally taken a long-delayed step to stop the widespread use of racial restrictive covenants. The Federal Housing Administration has announced that after a specified date it will refuse to aid the financing of any properties if a covenant racially restricting the use or occupancy of the property has been recorded. At the same time the Housing and Home Finance Administration has issued a new regulation for Slum Clearance and Urban Redevelopment that goes even farther. It prohibits the placing of any covenant on land sold or leased by local public agencies for redevelopment purposes that restricts the sale or occupancy of the property on the basis of race, color or creed.

Although both regulations are in accord with the 1948 decision of the Supreme Court that restrictive covenants cannot be enforced in the courts, Southern real-estate interests and Congressmen have assailed the policy as "Truman's most ruthless, tyrannical act."

Jack Helm, executive vice-president of the Home Builders' Association of New Orleans, said, "I don't know how it's going to apply down here. We're building homes for white people. Do they expect us to sell them to Negroes, too?" The confusion was so great that FHA Commissioner Franklin D. Richards issued a clarifying statement that the new regulations will not affect covenants now on record; it simply bars builders from signing written agreements restricting tenants.

Some 300 housing experts at a conference of the New York State Committee on Discrimination in Housing last week passed a resolution urging the FHA to go beyond the new

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy and refuse aid to any housing project which practises discrimination, even though no restrictive agreement is on file. The resolution declared that discrimination "by gentleman's agreement" should not receive federal support.

Actually, it was the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People that started the ball rolling with a letter to President Truman last February charging the FHA with lending "its full support" to the perpetuation of "black ghettos." White House, FHA and NAACP representatives met together to work out the new policy. Thurgood Marshall, attorney for the NAACP, who sat in on some of the conferences, said the new regulation is "a terrific step forward," but added that the next step is to have the FHA declare it will make no loans unless the borrower pledges non-discriminatory use of his property. The Negro groups would like the FHA to follow the lead of Nathaniel S. Keith, federal director of slum clearance and urban redevelopment, who announced that from now on federal funds for slum clearance will be denied public agencies if the slum area is to be redeveloped on a covenanted basis.

MORE MONOPOLY EVIDENCE

The first study since before the war on the degree of concentration of output in major American industries corroborates the findings of the Federal Trade Commission on the extreme stage of monopoly that has now been reached.

The Department of Commerce has found that in 144 of 440 industries studied, the four largest companies manufacture more than 50 percent of total production in that field. In 43 of the 440 industries, the first four companies are responsible for more than 75 percent of production.

Dividing these industries into 20 broad groups, the Commerce Department found even clearer evidence of intense concentration. Of the total shipments in the broad group of tobacco manufacturers, for instance, 82 percent in 1947 were made by branches of the industry in which the four largest companies accounted for 75 percent of production. In the broad group of rubber manufacturers, 65 percent of the shipments were by industrial sections dominated to the extent of 75 percent by the top four companies. More than 65 percent of shipments of electrical machinery were made by industries in which the first four producers account for 50 percent of the total.

The Celler Committee on Study of Monopoly Power, at whose request the Commerce Department analysis was prepared, has performed a useful service in reassembling the facts about increasing concentration. Surely Representative Celler (D, N. Y.) and the other members of his group now have an abundance of evidence, from the extensive hearings just completed, on which to base a definite legislative proposal for dealing in the next session of Congress with this economic threat.

THE LOBBY AGAINST CO-OPS

The tactics of the National Tax Equality Association in North Dakota may lead to an investigation of that organization when Congress comes back in January. Senator Milton Young (R, N. D.) recently revealed that the association, which leads the drive to tax dividends of coöperatives, offered him a $10,000 political war chest to back its attack on farmers' co-ops. Young turned down the offer and threatened to denounce the "NTEA's scurrilous methods" on the floor of the Senate next month. Senator Young charges that the NTEA has circulated a letter from an "anonymous Senator" which was actually a personal letter that he had written to a North Dakota farmer, "unscrupulously twisted" by the NTEA for its own purposes.

The NTEA was among the biggest spenders registered this year under the Lobbying Act. The organization reported nine months' receipts of $367,833 and $44,373 expenses for Congressional lobbying. The National Associated Businessmen, Inc., closely tied to the NTEA, received $30,923 and spent $29,205 during the same period. These two groups received many contributions from local organizations such as the Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., the Nebraska Tax Equality Committee and the Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc.

The new Special House Committee to Investigate Lobbying, headed by Representative Frank Buchanan (D, Pa.), is now studying the NTEA with the intention of holding a full-scale investigation into its lobbying activities next year.

OUTSIDE AMERICA

Toward a Calabrian field, far southward beyond the Eboli where Christ stopped, the spit-and-polish jeeps raced. In them were uniformed men with tommy-guns and blackjacks ready to use; they were the hand-picked, strong-armed, quick-triggered members of Interior Minister Mario Scelba's *reparto celere*—the fast section—that looks and acts more like a wartime commando force than like an adjunct of the national police.

On the field was a ragged crowd of men and women, boys and girls in their teens—day-laboring peasants, landless, workless. The field was part of a vast estate belonging to a rich nobleman landowner, much of it entirely unused, uncultivated for years, other parts assigned for cultivation to coöperatives of peasants under conditions they could not, despite their best will, meet. The peasants were digging in the ground with rough, mostly homemade, tools. The commander of the jeeps told them to stop digging in the name of the law. The peasants continued to dig; they were hungry, miserable, too desperate to care.

And as for the law: Article 44 of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Constitution of the Italian Republic reads:

In order to bring about the rational exploitation of the soil and to stabilize equitable social relations, the law imposes obligations and restraints on private ownership of land, fixes limits on its extension according to the needs in the various agrarian regions and zones, promotes and imposes the reclamation of land, the transformation of the great estates. . . .

In the region where the landless peasants and armed police faced one another, Baron Alfonso Barraco owns more than 38,000 acres, 6,000 sheep and vast olive fields; Count Paolo Gaetani, whose wife is a Barraco; Baron Giulio Berlingieri and other absentee landlords own similar tracts. None of the peasants owns anything. Rome has given promises and a few unenforced laws.

The peasants in the field at Melissa in the Fragola area knew their danger. Other groups in Calabria had in recent weeks been doing what they now were doing; the jeeps had ridden them down, clubbed them, used tear gas on them in *nome della legge*. From the Melissa group a handmade grenade flew at Scelba's men. The tommy-guns answered. When the peasants began running, a dozen wounded, some quite seriously, were left behind with the homemade tools; and there were two dead, Francesco Nigro and Giovanni Zito, both 18-year-old day laborers. A third peasant died soon afterward.

The Italian General Federation of Labor then called for one of its short nationwide strikes as a symbolic protest. This organization is dominated by the Communists, and at once most of the newspapers headlined variants of the Rome *Il Tempo's* "Day-Laborers Aroused by Communist Agitators." The Rome correspondent of the New York *Herald Tribune* followed his "lead" about the strike with a half-dozen paragraphs suggesting that it was planned and ordered by the European Communists—Canterbury's Red Dean, Bernal and Joliot-Curie, the Nobel Prize physicists, Picasso, etc.—meeting in another of the regular "peace conferences" decreed by Moscow; only far down in the story was there any mention of Calabria, and even there the impression was that the *celere* might have been bravely staving off the Red Army.

But, for once in a *democristian* Italy whose devotion to objective facts would have been praised by Goebbels and Pavolini, some of the facts *did* creep out in the non-Communist press. Mario Missiroli, the editor of *Il Messaggero*, semi-official organ of the government, wrote:

In recent months requests were made for the concession [to the peasants] of more than 20,000 acres of uncultivated or badly cultivated land. Only 1,800 acres were granted. At the same time 5,000 acres granted last year were withdrawn from the peasants. Moreover, the pay of the day-laborers averages between 250 and 300 lire a day, and the landowners were considering returning to the working conditions of 1945. [The dollar is now officially quoted at about 625 lire.]

A member of Alcide de Gasperi's Cabinet recently announced in the Chamber of Deputies the government's intention to set a minimum wage of 30,000 lire a month. But despite much talk, nothing has been done about land reform, partly because ECA's Italian chief, James Zellerbach, and his advisers fear that any splitting of land, presumably even uncultivated land, might reduce productivity.

Another *democristian* writer, Corrado Calvo, went down to Cutro, one of the towns in the area of the "Communist invasions." He wrote:

I found the people more like those convalescing in a filthy, putrifying hospital than ones who were considering revolution. Never in any other part of the world have I seen such people—consumptive, ravaged by disease, showing open wounds and unhealed injuries and sores, covered by clouds of repulsive flies. Because the houses are practically uninhabitable, these people are out in the roads in a sea of mud, filth, and scraps and bits of horrors of all sorts with which they have not the strength or will to cope. . . .

The houses themselves are unbelievable—worse than war ruins. In a few square yards, literally dozens of persons crowd together in an unbearable atmosphere of physical stench and degradation, men, women and children. I saw seven persons in a single bed, and two young girls asleep under it. Ugliness arises from such promiscuity, moral and physical contagions. Tuberculosis reigns supreme here. The mortality rate reaches fantastic proportions. Lack of water makes the situation worse. There is one single miserable fountain for the whole town, and in front of it the women fight terrible battles for precedence every day, for fear the small supply will run out. . . .

Bread is scarce, meat an unattainable luxury. A handful of *fave* [a kind of broad green lima bean] and a bit of onion serve for dinner and supper; and when there is work, some spaghetti on Sunday. Illiteracy reaches ninety percent. . . . These people do not know what the word Communist means, and they live in a state of resignation that resembles a coma. But by now they have reached the final limit beyond which a man becomes a beast. . . . They don't know the meaning of classes or of party politics, they have no conception of social claims. Before they can learn, they must have water to drink, modest beds to sleep in and a bit of healthy food to nourish them.

Because of such reports as this in anti-Communist papers, the boys at Melissa did not die entirely in vain. For fear that legislation damaging to their feudal monopoly might at last be brought up, some of the landowners in Calabria made a number of concessions. Some of the dispossessals were revoked. Land taken from peasant coöperatives during the last six months was restored to them. About 12,500 acres of uncultivated or badly cultivated land will be added to this. Family allotments to day-laborers, suspended since 1947, will be resumed.

The Communist Party's official Rome newspaper, *L'Unita*, headlined, "The Day-Laborers Have Won," implying that this was a victory for Communism too. And so it may be if ECA Zellerbach's purchasers and paymasters of democracy in Rome's Via Veneto don't look up from their bloodless statistics and into the horrible Calabrian hovels.

PERCY WINNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SUPREME COURT IS STANDING PAT

by Fred Rodell

SOME LEGAL HISTORIAN, in days to come, may well look back on the decade from 1939 to 1949 and dub it the Supreme Court's Golden Age. Not that the dates are quite so precise; history, despite the historians, rarely cuts its periods clean at the edges. The Golden Age could be said to have started in 1937 when the old Hughes Court, before a single Roosevelt appointment, sniffed the political wind, got a lungful of FDR's court plan, and hastily began to remove judicial road-blocks from the path of progressive legislation. The Age could be said to have come to its close about three years ago, after the substitution of bumbling Justice Burton for competent and far less conservative Justice Roberts and the replacing of an able, liberal Chief Justice with a stodgy second-rater had lowered the Court's caliber and, by every standard, quantitative and qualitative, weakened its performance.

Yet the '39-'49 decade roughly marks a span of Supreme Court glory. They were years when the Court, predominantly manned by Roosevelt appointees, stood out, despite lapses, as the most consistently liberal branch of our tripartite federal government. They were years when the Court pushed far beyond any of its predecessors in its upholding of civil rights, its protection of labor and its reluctance to interfere with the heavy taxation of wealth or the effective regulation of business. They were years, even as they drew to their end, when almost any humanitarian or progressive cause could find on the Court, if not a sympathetic majority, then a probable four stanch dissenting defenders.

Two of those stanch defenders are gone now, and, viewing their successors in even the most charitable light, it is clear that the Court's short span of glory is gone, as well, with Justices Murphy and Rutledge. Indeed, that pair of personally gentle yet intellectually fiery crusaders of the law must surely have turned in their fresh graves when their places on the high bench were taken by the ineffable Tom Clark and the unimpressive, irascible "Shay" Minton.

Not since Warren Harding loaded the Court for ultra-conservatism with the appointment, in quick succession, of Taft, Sutherland, Butler and Sanford has there been a quartet even remotely comparable to Truman's first four Justices. Coolidge and Hoover, though hide-bound Republicans, gave the Court some of its brightest lights of this century in Stone, Hughes, Roberts and Cardozo. Every one of Roosevelt's eight appointees was a man of greater capacity than any of Truman's four—unless Minton should barely manage to outshine Byrnes. And whereas even a couple of Harding's choices were able if reactionary judges, Truman has now staffed almost half the Court with mediocrity or worse.

Fred Vinson was named Chief Justice, by common report, in order to spread the oil of his ingratiating personality on the Court's troubled factional waters. In this he has conspicuously failed; the proportion of split decisions, of written dissents and of separate concurring opinions has risen to often ludicrous heights since he took over. But this has been the least of Vinson's failures. He has set his brethren the worst example of any Chief Justice in memory by making no effort to carry his fair share of the Court's real workload—that is, the writing of majority opinions. Perhaps in one sense this has been a healthy thing, for, just as his vote on most close questions of public import has gone with the Court's conservatives, what few opinions he has written have rarely been distinguished for their liberalism or their legal craftsmanship. In three years, he has personally handled only three matters of any moment—the Lewis contempt case, the Harris search-and-seizure case and the grouped cases dealing with restrictive covenants against Negroes—and in the first two of these his strained justifications of the illiberal majority holdings were demolished by brilliant, biting dissents.

If Vinson, as a judge, has been unproductive and uninspired, his performance as administrative chief of the Court has been no less slipshod. True, his distribution of types of cases among the various Justices —for cases can be important, interesting, backbreaking or boring—has been eminently fair, as Stone's assignments too often were not. But Vinson, despite the fact that the Court's load of cases is much lighter than a few years ago, either does not know or does not care how to make most of his colleagues get at their work and get it done. He lets a backlog of opinions-to-be-written pile up for months, so that the Court's two or three efficient work-horses get assigned far more than their share, and so that the Court has to stay in session for extra weeks every

Fred Rodell was born in Philadelphia and studied at Haverford, the University of London and the Yale Law School. He has worked on and contributed to magazines, is the author of several books, was a legal adviser to the late Governor Gifford Pinchot of Pennsylvania and is a professor in the Yale Law School.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

summer—whereas the Hughes Court, by contrast, used to handle literally twice as many cases a term and finish up its business regularly and promptly by around June 1.

One of the reasons for the Court's production slowdown of late cannot be laid to Vinson; it is the presence on the Court of Truman's first appointee, Harold Burton. To write critically of Burton is an unpleasant task, for he is personally a decent, earnest, hard-trying citizen. But the blunt fact is that you can search the Court records for a hundred years back without finding a Justice of more limited legal and judicial capacity. It is a big year for Burton when he manages to grind out five or six majority opinions out of a Court total of well over a hundred. Those opinions range in quality from passable to pathetic; Burton is an old-fashioned, narrow-gauged precedent-worshiper who tries interminably to match cases as a woman shopper matches colors. His meticulous and myopic concern with irrelevancies and trivia makes much of his work almost a parody of the judicial process. He is also, in his unsophisticated way, the Court's most obvious conservative.

If anyone can conceivably make Burton look good by contrast, the likeliest candidate is Tom Clark. Perhaps it is premature to judge a judge before he starts judging; Murphy, for one, surprised even his friends with the judicial power he came to reveal on the bench; Black surprised no one who knew him. But certainly there is nothing anywhere in Clark's record to suggest that he holds the slightest qualification for the job.

It is the record of a smiling, superficial, opportunistic man-on-the-make whose political loyalty and personal charm have greased his way up without the need for him to prove he possesses any imagination, integrity or intelligence. In the Department of Justice, he was almost wholly dependent on his aides to do his legal brainwork for him; it is reasonably reported that he was about to be fired from his assistant attorney-generalship for incompetence when Roosevelt died and Clark's good friend, Truman, elevated him to the Cabinet instead. If it be said that, in Justice, his heart was as right on anti-trust prosecutions as it was wrong on labor and civil liberties, be it remembered that attorneys-general more ardently crusading than he—McReynolds and Jackson, to name a couple—have turned completely conservative on the bench. It is unthinkable that Clark will ever go to the Left of his mentor, Vinson, who strongly backed his appointment—and did so, according to an obviously apocryphal but widespread Washington yarn, because Vinson wanted *someone* on his Court who knew less law than he did.

Faint praise though it be, Sherman Minton bids fair to become the best of Truman's Justices. Not that his eight-year record on the Circuit Court of Appeals betokens anything approaching a first-rate judicial mind; his opinions, usually sloppy or off-the-beam or just plain pedestrian, are not in a class with those of such federal judges as Clark and Frank of the second circuit, and at his age, 59, he is not likely to blossom suddenly on the Supreme Court. But to call him, as some have, a Burton of the Left, is to overstate his shortcomings; less ploddingly conscientious than Burton, he gets more work done. Moreover, the political sympathies he displayed in the Senate as a raging New Dealer, plus his outspoken admiration of Justices Black and Douglas, reveal a slant which should lead him to vote with those two last champions of a militant legal liberalism, however ungifted he may be at explaining why. Still, even here a finger-crossing caveat may be in order. For Minton's slant is less the product of profound or original thinking than of enthusiastic party regularity. A political radical, he is nevertheless an intellectual conservative. And that essential conservatism, that yen for the regular, may yet, unhappily, prove responsive to the little blandishments which Justice Frankfurter has already started lavishing on Minton to try to draw him into the camp of the Court's now clearly conservative majority.

Whether Minton sticks with Black and Douglas or slips slowly over to the more comfortable Right will actually make little difference in the new Court's decisions. The old Black-Douglas-Murphy-Rutledge quartet could sometimes, in closely disputed cases, convince one more man—usually Reed on business regulation or labor matters, occasionally Vinson on an economic question or even Frankfurter on a civil-rights issue—and turn a decision their way. Today, even with Minton, the trio will need an unlikely two converts to carry any close case for their liberal views. "Black and Douglas dissenting" or "Black, Douglas, and Minton dissenting" is destined to become, beginning this term, as familiar a phrase as was "Holmes and Brandeis dissenting"—and then "Holmes, Brandeis, and Stone dissenting"—a generation ago.

For Truman, as well as debasing the Court's judicial caliber, has shifted its slant steeply toward the Right. This shift is vividly underlined by the relative spot in the lineup now held by Justice Reed—that genial, unpredictable, all too often incomprehensible individualist. As Roosevelt left the Court, Reed, though the swing-man on some kinds of cases, was a trifle to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Right of Center, since Stone was well to the Left of him on civil liberties and on several important tax issues.

Today, no matter where Minton votes, Reed, no light of liberalism, is suddenly and clearly Left of Center. At the far Right, along with Burton, are Justices Frankfurter and Jackson—the former, the Court's great expert at legal needlework who purports to reach his almost invariably conservative results by the use of impersonal, ineluctable logic; the latter, the Court's most eloquent, emotional and often intemperate conservative spokesman who holds no illusions about the personal nature of judicial power. Also to Reed's Right, on almost every conceivable issue, are Vinson and, indubitably, Clark. Thus, the Chief Justice, an innate conservative, now lines up square in the Court's middle (except on civil rights, where he has been its most reactionary member) and from that position, with Clark's vote very probably in his pocket, holds effective control of the new Court's split decisions.

Not that the terms "conservative" and "liberal" are timeless absolutes. No Supreme Court of today or tomorrow will ever go back to the die-hard days when the federal government's power to act on a national scale was judicially crippled under a narrow view of the "commerce clause" and almost every state attempt at social legislation used to run afoul of the Fourteenth Amendment; none of Truman's Fair Deal, in housing, health or education, is going to be called unconstitutional. But "liberal" is still a meaningful word to connote, not merely a greater concern for human welfare than property rights, but a dynamic philosophy of law that would move legal rules and horizons ever farther ahead in the constantly changing context of the times; "conservatives"—past, present and future—want to stand still. It may serve the special purposes of Professor Thomas Reed Powell, Justice Frankfurter's greatest apologist, to call the Court's present conservatives "tough" and its liberals "tender"—in much the same sense that a Lincoln is tender, a Hoover tough. But no labels of praise or opprobrium can alter the basic fact that the Supreme Court, which for ten or twelve years has been moving the law forward to meet the new needs and new challenges, is about to enter a standpat phase which may include elements of retrogression wherever liberal rulings of recent years have squeaked through by a bare 5-to-4 majority.

As Black and Douglas increasingly protest, in dissent, against judicial statics, one somewhat amusing paradox may ensue. Chief Justice Vinson is going to have trouble getting majority opinions written at all. For, over the past several terms, Black and Douglas have carried the elephant's share of the Court's heavy work; between them they have written around 40 percent of the Court's majority opinions, averaging more than twice as many apiece as the other seven Justices; and until Justice Murphy fell sick a couple of years ago, these three liberals together used to bear well over half of this basic Court burden. Where—except to Reed and Jackson, who have shirked their work less than their conservative fellows—can Vinson turn now to get opinions written when the Court splits and the liberals, inevitably, lose? With Clark a helpless and probably hopeless judicial neophyte, with Burton sadly incompetent to produce and Vinson unwilling if not unable to shoulder a full share himself, with Frankfurter so busy preserving for posterity the precise patterns of his thinking processes, in special concurrences and separate dissents, that he lets the Court's work go hang—how will the newly conservative Court ever get its real work done?

There is one possible answer—easy and ominous. For the Court, in various technical ways, can simply refuse to hear almost any case that somebody tries to bring before it. Most cases reach the Supreme Court on "petition for certiorari," and the Court's rule is that such a petition will not be granted unless four Justices vote to grant it. In past years, many an important case—especially in the field of human rights and liberties—has been forced on a reluctant Court by the combined vote of Black, Douglas, Murphy and Rutledge. Sometimes these four, when the case was heard, could win over one or more colleagues for a liberal decision; if not, the case would at least be spread on the record for all to see, complete with their dissent. But there is no fourth Justice to join with Black and Douglas and maybe Minton in pushing such cases before the Court today. And in the very first weeks of the present term, the Court turned down several cases involving human rights, over the futile protest of Justices Black and Douglas.

Perhaps the pattern is there revealed by which Chief Justice Vinson, five colleagues concurring, plans to achieve a deceptive double purpose. By cutting down to a new low the number of cases the Court hears, and thus cutting the number of opinions to be written, he may hope to conceal his Court's incompetence. And by cutting out many controversial cases which would provoke a liberal dissent, he may hope to build a surface record of smooth judicial harmony and conceal his Court's conservatism. If so, to the characterization of the Truman-Vinson Court as incompetent and conservative, there can be added another adjective—irresponsible.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A VISIT TO FRANCO'S SPAIN

by Philip Singer & Gilbert Cranberg

SEVERAL American Congressmen have come back recently from Spain singing the praises of Franco and of the conditions he has created. Franco, it turns out, is a very lovable character, and things in Spain are just fine—though they would, of course, be better if she got a big loan from the United States or were included in the Marshall Plan, or both.

These views are completely at variance with the ones we have reached after a month's visit to all parts of Spain, during which we talked with many individuals of all social levels and all political sympathies. We also checked what we were told in Spain by talks with Spanish Loyalist refugees in France, including Indalecio Prieto, president of the Spanish Socialist Party.

Our information is that Franco continues a precarious hold on Spain thanks partly to the support he gets from the US Government. He does so by means of an army and a police force which cost about 50 percent of the Spanish budget; by an alliance with the Catholic Church, which itself has lost touch with the people; and in spite of desperate and deepening poverty, and the failure of Spanish youth to rally to his standard. His chief weapon, and thus far a successful one, is the prediction that if his regime were overthrown, the Communists would come in.

Franco is one European who believes in modern advertising methods. Like his late fellow dictators, Hitler and Mussolini, with whom he was on such friendly terms, he plasters the country with posters repeating his slogan, "Franco Si, Communismo No." Everywhere, members of the regime parrot his arguments:

Only the Franco regime stands between the Spanish people and the Kremlin.

The special Spanish temperament and character make democratic Western procedures and representative government impossible.

Only Franco is able to maintain order and stability.

The Franco economy [national syndicalism] is the middle way between the collectivism of Communism and the exploitation of capitalism.

Protestantism and Masonry are foreign ideologies that attempt to destroy the Catholic unity of Spanish life.

That Spain has not won acceptance in the Western European family of nations is because of Protestants and Masons in high places, such as Secretary of State Acheson, President Truman and Mrs. Roosevelt.

(When we tried to explain to a Falange official in the headquarters of the labor syndicate in Barcelona that there are American Catholics who also oppose Franco, such as Philip Murray, he replied with conviction, "They are contaminated.")

How successful Franco has been in persuading the average Spaniard that he is the last bulwark against Communism, it is hard to say. But the majority of the people we spoke to firmly rejected this idea. One man commented wryly:

"According to Franco, I'm a Communist. But Franco calls everyone a Red who doesn't agree with him."

When we asked whether he thought Spain would go Communist if Franco fell, his answer was typical of many others:

"No! We want neither Franco nor Communism. We know what it is to live under a dictator, and we don't want another."

It is difficult for one who has not been there lately to realize the deep poverty of the Spanish people. There are a few millionaires and a minute middle class, which is struggling along; the great majority barely maintain life. The black market is everywhere. Side by side with scarecrow women selling illegal bread and olive oil under the Church walls one can see Franco's soldiers calmly smoking black-market American cigarettes. It is no wonder that one so often hears the cynical comment that the army runs the black market for its personal benefit.

We were told over and over that because the Church is tied so closely to the dictatorship, it has lost much popularity with the rank and file of the people. Bitter jokes about priests are almost as common as those about Franco.

Franco's most serious failure is with the young people, on whom every dictatorship ultimately depends. In other countries, both Fascist and Communist governments have found it comparatively easy to capture the youth; but this is not true of the Frente de Juventud, the youth division of the Falange. In spite of snappy uniforms, a busy program of youth activities, and even summer camps, the voluntary membership is pitifully small—only 160,000 out of a potential five million between the ages of 15 and 21.

Philip Singer and Gilbert Cranberg are free-lance writers living in New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet in a negative sense Franco is succeeding, for he has prevented anti-Franco troops from recruiting younger members. The organized opposition is confined to those who were part of it before the Civil War; as the years go by, with the majority of them known to the police and given only conditional liberty, it becomes virtually impossible for anyone to engage in effective underground work.

Nobody inside Spain seriously suggests the possibility of a successful revolution. Everyone agrees that the United States could probably effect Franco's downfall in a short time by refusing to send any more gasoline or oil, but his opponents, both inside and outside of Spain, know that there is no probability of this at any time in the near future.

At St. Jean de Luz, just a few miles across the Spanish border, we talked to Prieto, who continues to direct Spanish Socialist policy though he has been confined to his home by illness for the past year. Despite this illness, he spoke with great vigor when he denied that Communist strength is growing in Spain.

"The Spanish people are not Communists now," he said. "Nevertheless, they are bound to listen when the Communists tell them that only Russia is against Franco; we liberals can make no effective reply, for we can point to no country which is ardently on our side. The United States helps the Communist propaganda by such acts as sending the Navy on official visits. It is losing prestige among the Spanish people, and in a few years they will have no choice but to turn to Russia. If you continue on your present course," he said grimly, "Socialists all over the world will turn against the US." Then, as though seeking to convince himself more than to persuade us, he added, "However, I still believe Secretary Acheson when he says that the United States is on the side of democracy."

THE DEFENSE OF THE TITO REGIME

by Frank Gervasi

YUGOSLAVIA is a police state. But it would be unfair to let it go at that. The country, its regime and most particularly Marshal Tito himself are in constant danger from Cominform agents. It is surrounded by Soviet satellites, each able to smuggle spies, saboteurs and potential assassins over the long, contiguous frontiers, at will, and each a possible base for guerrilla and military operations against Ljubljana, Zagreb or Belgrade. The destruction of the Marshal and his regime is an axiom of Russian policy in an Eastern Europe—a Communist world, in fact—suddenly become granular with Titoist heresy.

As hard as it can, Yugoslavia is advancing a far-reaching social revolution. It no longer has approximately 200,000 chronically unemployed in a population of only 16 million, or roughly a million of its people suffering from insecurity. Without Marshall Plan help and in spite of a Soviet and satellite blockade, it has completed reconstruction after a war which left it worse off than any other Allied nation except Poland. No greater disservice could be rendered the cause of democracy in Europe than to write off Yugoslavia—as too many of the top brass in the Military Establishment and the State Department were inclined to do—as just another totalitarian Communist country, and therefore unworthy of Western aid, or one to which assistance should be conditional upon relaxation of the police state, restoration of civil liberties and/or abandonment of social revolution, *i. e.*, reënthronement of free enterprise.

Up to now, the politically less literate Pentagonists have been overruled, as have those opponents of aid to Tito in the State Department—George Kennan curiously among them—who regarded the Tito-Stalin feud as merely a "Red dogfight." Dean Acheson saw that to have failed to prop up Tito economically or to have insisted on any political *quids* for economic *quos* would simply have handed Yugoslavia back to the Kremlin. His view prevailed in the Department and at meetings of the National Security Council at which our "no-strings" policy was framed. Holdouts persist in the Military Establishment; they are headed by Louis Johnson, to whom any Communist is ipso facto a servant of the Kremlin and, therefore, an enemy of "democracy" *i. e.*, of capitalism.

If Johnson would read the voluminous files of the Central Intelligence Agency, the State Department and the Armed Services themselves, he might discover a few truths about the Europe that is taking form in the postwar years. He might learn that capitalism is not synonymous with democracy and that, moreover, it is as dead as the dodo on this continent, in spite of Marshall Plan aid and other enormous transfusions of American dollars. He might also learn that the real enemy of democracy in Europe is not social revolution or the social content of Communism, but Soviet imperialism. And that is what Tito is fighting.

This is the second of two articles by Frank Gervasi, well-known foreign correspondent, who has just completed a month's visit to Yugoslavia.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tito cannot relax his police-state grip on Yugoslavia nor can he abandon or retard social revolution. With the first he defends himself and his regime. With the second he fulfills his commitments to Communist followers who share his fierce Yugoslav independence but would look with lethal disfavor upon betrayal of Marxist-Leninist principles.

One detects in Yugoslavia, in talking with peasants and workers and even officials, definite aspirations toward a liberalization of their regime. Not one but a dozen officials—and Yugoslavs are not given to currying favor—told this reporter that restoration of civil liberties is a specific objective of the regime, to be reached as quickly as conditions permit. The constitutional protection of private property and private enterprise as long as they are not used for exploitation is rigidly respected.

Yugoslavia's orientation toward democracy in the Western sense, politically speaking, is entirely possible. It would not surprise anyone familiar with the country to see it evolve along social-democratic lines, once it has created a sound economic basis for social-democracy. That it will, depends entirely upon whether the country can survive the difficult 18 months to two years ahead. Its survival, in turn, rests upon the amount and kind of Western assistance.

Titoism, which is probably a more mature Communism and certainly a Socialism independent of Soviet domination and therefore anti-imperialist, will not, however, spread either as rapidly or as widely as some experts hope, at least not in Eastern Europe. Titoism was possible in Yugoslavia because favorable circumstances for its emergence prevailed. These were, among others: a simon-pure, native Communism; absence of the Red Army, and physical remoteness from Soviet soil.

Those prerequisites for Titoist heresy are not present in Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria or Hungary. Besides, Titoism has happened. The Russians will presumably know how to deal with it in those countries where they are physically present when the first symptoms appear. A good deal of preventive medicine in the form of trials, purges and tighter Soviet control over satellite armed forces already has been administered.

What Titoism may bring about—in fact already has in some countries—is a cleavage in Communist ranks. Greek resistance collapsed when the guerrillas divided into Tito and Cominformist halves. There are faint but perceptible evidences of Titoism among Italian Communists and their Nenni Socialist affiliates.

The idea that Tito represents a socialism independent of Soviet policies and controls might prove very attractive west of the Iron Curtain. If it gained enough adherents, Titoism might wreck Moscow's dream of a Communist world of federated Soviet socialist republics, self-governed but dependent upon the Kremlin for direction of foreign policies and trade. That is why the Soviets will do everything within their power to destroy Tito and his regime.

Tito is ready for the worst, short of actual Russian invasion of Yugoslavia, although he does not exclude that possibility. He anticipates guerrilla forays by Hungarian, Rumanian, Bulgarian and Greek hirelings of the Russians. He foresees attempts to assassinate him and to sabotage bridges and military installations. He does not believe that Russia itself would invade Yugoslavia, for this would mean, in his opinion, the beginning of World War III, which, he is convinced, Russia does not desire.

But the West should face the harshest of the truths of the Belgrade-Moscow wrangle. This is that even if Russia does not itself attack Yugoslavia, the threat to world peace would be none the less real.

How to prevent *any* aggression against Yugoslavia by Russia or its satellites? That is the question with which the State Department, the National Security Council and the Military Establishment must wrestle at once. Economic assistance to Yugoslavia will help Tito make his socialism work and gain for his regime that increased strength which comes of a better standard of living. That added strength would ensure Yugoslav resistance to any attack from within or without.

But how to ensure that the attack will not materialize? Perhaps, some of our top diplomats dealing with Yugoslav affairs say, this could be done by warning Russia that the West intends to give Yugoslavia military assistance—weapons and munitions—if it is attacked. Enunciation of such a policy would undoubtedly multiply the risks to the West already inherent in the situation. But the dangers would probably be no greater than those implicit in the Atlantic Pact's military clauses. This, it seems, is an era of risks, calculated and otherwise.

Two possible byproducts of Titoism offer as much of a threat to Western capitalist democracy as Soviet imperialism itself. Titoism could produce a new social revolution of its own, one free of the dictates of the Kremlin, one in which Socialist states could join in a loose confederation, each economically and politically independent. But—and who has calculated this risk?—the Kremlin, aware that its imperialist pattern of world Communism is unpopular and/or unworkable, might take over the Titoist idea, sacrificing the form to retain the substance of world revolution.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAROLD L. ICKES: On "Democratic" Portugal

WHEN SECRETARY ACHESON was in Germany recently he obligingly called upon Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of the new West German state. Dr. Adenauer might have called on Mr. Acheson without provoking the criticism that has been expressed, not only here, but abroad. In the *Nation* for December 3, Dr. J. Alvarez del Vayo, an experienced observer of international affairs, wrote: "The visit of Secretary of State Acheson to [Bonn], the most important act of homage rendered thus far to the newly established state, has scandalized public opinion throughout Europe."

However, the "homage" paid Dr. Adenauer by Mr. Acheson is nothing when compared with the obsequiousness of Ambassador W. Averell Harriman in going to Lisbon recently to spend three hours with Dictator Salazar of Portugal in the throne room of the Dictator himself. This flattering deference to Dr. Adenauer and Dictator Salazar is notice to chiefs of state everywhere that, if they have any favors to ask of America, they need not go to the trouble of calling upon us. We shall be glad to send our "Fuller Brush men" of the highest rank, to the chancellery of any nation, to accept orders for pre-Christmas delivery.

In Dr. del Vayo's article one may also read of "a comic interlude" that occurred at a recent session of the UN when former Senator John Sherman Cooper, "seriously and eloquently described Portugal . . . as a model democratic country." The most charitable interpretation of this colorful extravaganza is that the gentleman from Kentucky probably was only trying to keep in step with our State Department.

The best that can be said for the government of the police state, Portugal, is that it is just as democratic as is Spain. It might be that, for pretended reasons of state, it was necessary for Mr. Harriman, of course with the consent of the Department of State, to go to Lisbon to discourage the liberals of that country by publicly giving countenance to Dictator Salazar, but why be hypocritical or untruthful about it? Why does our State Department insist upon drugging the conscience of the people with lies so blatant that they are worse than stupid? It should be remembered that the same Admiral Conolly who sailed, at the head of a naval squadron, to El Ferrol, Spain, to bestow the benisons of a great democracy upon a scurvy dictatorship, and to salute Franco, had already done violence to democratic principles by a visit to Portugal.

Were these ingratiating gestures with or without the knowledge or consent of the State Department? If they were in accord with State Department policy, the question is why?—in view of Mr. Acheson's assurances that we can have no truck with Spain because the Franco regime is Fascist. If these two obeisances were without sanction by the State Department, what has Mr. Acheson done to impress upon the Secretary of the Navy the fact that he (Acheson) is Secretary of State and does not permit any interference with his duties and rights by the Secretary of the Navy, let alone a mere admiral?

It may be that the State Department is deceiving the people because it mistrusts them. In any event, its policy in certain respects seems to be to conceal or misrepresent the facts. Feigned frankness is the best possible device for the obfuscation of the uninformed. Not only is Portugal as much of a dictatorship as is Spain; the fact is that in Madrid a Spaniard may venture to speak critically of the Franco tyranny to a companion in a café but in Lisbon no one would dare to speak against the Portuguese ruler above a whisper, and then only behind closed doors. Salazar's hand is heavier than that of Franco, even if it is less bloody. He prefers the concentration camp for suspected dissidents, to the shedding of their blood. Both countries are one-party states—the party of the Dictator. In neither is there freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, freedom of the press or freedom of religion. What Ambassador Harriman and Admiral Conolly have imprudently done has added to the prestige of both of these dictators. This is especially true of Salazar, whose cringing Portugal an uninformed former US Senator chooses to regard as "a model democratic country."

We have had it in our power peacefully and legitimately to advance the cause of democracy in these two cowed countries. We have chosen, passively so far in Spain, but actively as to Portugal—through the giving of largess—to help to thwart any impulse toward democracy or liberty. As to both countries, those who still long for liberty are aghast at, and discouraged by, our bankruptcy in our role of "defender" of democracy. The least that Secretary Acheson might do is to tell the truth about Salazar and so give the American people an opportunity to say whether they are willing to have their millions spent in Portugal to hold a freedom-starved nation in subjugation.

HAROLD L. ICKES

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

FROM DEPRESSIONS TO SCHNORKELS: ONCE OVER LIGHTLY

by James R. Newman

VANNEVAR BUSH'S new book is strikingly faithful to the man himself. It is honest, garrulous, controversial, hopeful, naïve, prejudiced and, at times, apocalyptic in a Yankee sort of way; it reflects the range of Dr. Bush's career: engineer, university professor and administrator, government official (wartime head of the Office of Scientific Research and Development), foundation head (Carnegie Institute); and the diversity of his interests: science, technology, weapons, politics, business, education, international affairs, the practical workings of a democratic society. It is written, in large part, in Bush's characteristic style, easy and salty, affecting various down-Eastisms and deliberate banalities to emphasize his none-of-your-nonsense-sir-let's-get-down-to-costs approach to the problems of science and society.

MODERN ARMS AND FREE MEN, by Vannevar Bush (Simon and Schuster; cloth, $3.50; paper, $1).

The title of the book is misleadingly narrow, for its 275 pages touch upon every problem that today vexes public attention. Roughly speaking, the essay divides into two parts. The first deals with warfare—what has been and what we may expect, with emphasis on the development of weapons; the second proffers an analysis of democracy, Communism, human history and destiny.

The broad sweep of Dr. Bush's social, economic and political commentary makes it difficult to attempt a serious appraisal. He moves so swiftly—and so lightly—from one topic to the next that it is hard to keep up. Mostly he pronounces generalities that are unobjectionable; mostly he manages to avoid the pitfalls of precise commitment. That his intentions are good is beyond question: he is outspokenly on the side of health, education, higher living standards, tolerance and peace—to a point. He is also outspokenly against sundry things every decent person ought to be against. His suggestion for economic ills is that "we must learn to avoid inflation and depression"; for labor disputes, that "we must learn to make our industrial machine operate smoothly and avoid the interruptions because of *quarrels over the division of product*" (my italics); for improved government administration, that "we must somehow produce governmental machinery that will operate efficiently for its intended purpose, so that the selfish interests of groups or sections cannot drain away our energies." He is sharply opposed to "state socialism" (the end of "government paternalism," to which we turn so often, is "inevitable and drab"), "bureaucrats," high taxes and undue interference, "even in the name of humanitarianism, with the diversified vigorous private initiative that made us great." Of course, Dr. Bush, who might be described as a liberal by the standards of the Reform Bill of 1832, is in favor of humanitarianism as such. As for foreign policy, he is of the school that believes that any government, however corrupt and tyrannical, is an ally worth cultivating provided it is genuinely anti-Soviet. We ought not, he feels, be so "strait-laced," so "rigidly doctrinaire," as to spurn "countries where true democracy is impossible... [which] do not or cannot for the moment subscribe to [our] ideals in detail...."

Dr. Bush on the proximity fuse, strategic bombing, guided missiles, biological warfare, the atom and the schnorkel is somewhat more precise. He says sensible things, many of which have been said before but rarely by anyone of such wide experience and impeccable position. Furthermore, he denounces the preventive-war mongers and those who see catastrophe as either imminent or inevitable. For this he deserves much thanks.

Even in this portion of his book, however, Dr. Bush is prone to indirection, to confusing qualifications, to flaccid arguments in place of proofs. If one asks what his main conclusions are on the future of warfare, it is hard to know how to answer.

For the time being, he suggests, the "defense may again be in the ascendant in land warfare" and the stalemate of the First World War "may" reappear. On the seas the "day of the great ship may be over" and the Navy will find its main task in combating submarines armed with schnorkels and long-range torpedoes. Proximity fuses, short-range guided missiles, radar, rockets, jet interceptors are among the tools that make obsolete the strategy of mass bombing even with high-altitude and high-speed bombers (B-36s). That is to say "obsolete" if one measures economic costs against results—an arithmetical exercise often regarded as beneath the notice of an officer of field rank. Dr. Bush is both shrewd and lucid in his analysis of cost limitations.

To what extent has the atom bomb altered these prospects? The book was written before it was announced that the Russians had the bomb, and Bush's thesis, so far as it applies to the next few years, rests on his assumption that we still have a good bit of "breathing time." Even so, certain of his opinions are not invalidated by the recent event. The "lone bomber," whatever its explosive freight, will "never get to its target over the territory of a fully alert and equipped enemy." To get through with at least a few bombs, a large (and vulnerable) fleet armed with atomic bombs must be dispatched. (Intercontinental guided mis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

siles are not a foreseeable reality.) Here Bush reminds us that atom bombs are still scarce, relatively speaking, and are likely to remain so for some years; also there is the question of costs—*i.e.*, what proportion of its resources a country can afford to allocate to a single weapon.

These and other considerations lead to the judgment that in a war which came soon the atom bomb would be "important but not absolute"; the war would be "no affair of pushbuttons" but a "tough slugging match"; toxic radioactive materials "could be used," but the difficulty of delivering and spreading them would be considerable; biological weapons, not of "major importance," would find their use, if at all, only in "subversive" phases of warfare. We shall win such a war, Bush is certain, if we stay strong, armed to the teeth, with a "retaliation force" composed of "young men straining at the leash," with the best planes and equipped with "bombs ready to go off." As a matter of fact, says Bush, if our defenses are strong enough, if we "win" the arms race (and as a democracy competing with a totalitarian state, the odds, he assures us, are all in our favor), we may never be called on to fight. (One questions whether history supports either assertion: that armaments help to keep the peace or that totalitarian states are unable to keep pace in an arms race.) Bush concludes, if total war "comes again to the world...it would be highly technical, and it would be fast and furious. It would leave the world shaken and broken. It would cost millions of lives and exhaust the accumulation of treasure of many years. It would not destroy civilization, any more than the last two wars have destroyed civilization, but it would assuredly set it back."

I suspect this is a fair statement of the prospect. I am puzzled, however, to reconcile it with some of Bush's earlier reassurances ("the technological future is far less dreadful and frightening than many of us have been led to believe"), not to speak of the publisher's blurb, which describes the diagnosis as "encouraging."

NOTABLE BOOKS OF 1949

THE FOLLOWING COMPILATION represents, in the *New Republic's* judgment, a minimum list of the year's books that merit attention. It excludes important publications of special interest as well as many works of both fiction and non-fiction that claimed only the amiable intention of amusing their publics.

While the editors themselves place a high value on some of the books included, this is certainly not true in every case. In many instances, the criterion for inclusion was the breadth and weight of impact; not its quality. One or two books appear below that have not been reviewed in the *New Republic*; in this way the editors make small amends for their neglect or the miscarriage of their plans.

FICTION

THE WITNESS, by Jean Bloch-Michel (Pantheon Books; $2.50).

THREE NOVELS, by Karel Capek (A. A. Wyn; $3.75).

A TREE OF NIGHT AND OTHER STORIES, by Truman Capote (Random House; $3).

TO BE A PILGRIM, by Joyce Cary (Harpers; $3).

TWO WORLDS AND THEIR WAYS, by I. Compton-Burnett (Alfred A. Knopf; $3.50).

THE GRAND DESIGN, by John Dos Passos (Houghton Mifflin; $3.50).

LOVING, by Henry Green (Viking; $3).

THE GIRL ON THE VIA FLAMINIA, by Alfred Hayes (Harpers; $2.50).

THE OASIS, by Mary McCarthy (Random House; $2).

THE SURE THING, by Merle Miller (William Sloane Associates; $3).

NINETEEN EIGHTY-FOUR, by George Orwell (Harcourt, Brace; $3).

THE BODY, by William Sansom (Harcourt, Brace; $2.75).

THE YOUNG LIONS, by Irwin Shaw (Random House; $3.95).

IN SICILY, by Elio Vittorini (New Directions; $2.50).

THE GOLDEN APPLES, by Eudora Welty (Harcourt, Brace; $3).

DESCENT INTO HELL, by Charles Williams (Pellegrini and Cudahy; $2.75).

MEMOIRS AND BIOGRAPHY

A DREAMER'S JOURNEY: The Autobiography of Morris Raphael Cohen, edited by Felix S. Cohen (Beacon Press; $4).

STALIN: A Political Biography, by Isaac Deutscher (Oxford University Press; $5).

STALIN & CO., by Walter Duranty (William Sloane Associates; $3).

THE UNIVERSE OF G. B. S., by William Irvine (Whittlesey House; $5).

THE DIARIES OF FRANZ KAFKA, edited by Max Brand (Schocken Books; 2 vols.; $3.75 each).

JOHN RUSKIN: The Portrait of a Prophet, by Peter Quennell (Viking Press; $3.75).

THIS I REMEMBER, by Eleanor Roosevelt (Harpers; $4.50).

ALFRED TENNYSON, by Charles Tennyson (Macmillan; $7.50).

TRIAL AND ERROR: The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann (Harpers; $5).

HISTORY

CHINA SHAKES THE WORLD, by Jack Belden (Harpers; $5).

THEIR FINEST HOUR, by Winston Churchill (Houghton Mifflin; $6).

THE SECOND WORLD WAR, by J. F. C. Fuller (Duell, Sloan and Pearce; $5).

THE CASE OF GENERAL YAMASHITA, by A. Frank Reel (University of Chicago Press; $4).

THE STATE OF EUROPE, by Howard K. Smith (Alfred A. Knopf; $3.75).

ROOSEVELT AND THE RUSSIANS, by Edward R. Stettinius Jr. (Doubleday; $4).

POETRY, CRITICISM & THE ARTS

Q ANTHOLOGY. Compiled and edited by F. Brittain (Macmillan; $4.50).

POETS AND STORY-TELLERS: A Book of Critical Essays, by David Cecil (Macmillan; $4).

DON QUIXOTE, by Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. Translated by Samuel Putnam (Viking Press; 2 vols., $10).

THE DIARY OF A WRITER, by F. M. Dostoievsky (Scribner's; 2 vols.; $12.50).

COLLECTED POEMS, by William Empson (Harcourt, Brace; $2.50).

NOTES TOWARD THE DEFINITION OF CULTURE, by T. S. Eliot (Harcourt, Brace; $2.50).

YEATS: THE MAN AND THE MASKS, by Richard Ellman (Macmillan; $5).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FRUITS OF THE EARTH, by André Gide (Alfred A. Knopf; $3).

THE CLASSICAL TRADITION, by Gilbert Highet (Oxford University Press; $6).

PAUL KLEE ON MODERN ART. With an Introduction by Herbert Read (George Efron; $2.50).

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ART, by André Malraux (Bollingen Series XXIV, Pantheon Books; 2 vols., boxed, $25).

THE GREAT TRADITION, by F. R. Leavis (George W. Stewart; $4.50).

DICKENS: HIS CHARACTER, COMEDY AND CAREER, by Hesketh Pearson (Harpers; $4).

LETTERS OF MARCEL PROUST. Translated and edited, with notes, by Mina Curtiss (Random House; $5).

AN ACRE IN THE SEED, by Theodore Spencer (Harvard University Press; $2.50).

SHAKESPEARE'S WORLD OF IMAGES, by Donald A. Stauffer (W. W. Norton; $5).

THE TRYING-OUT OF MOBY-DICK, by Howard P. Vincent (Houghton Mifflin; $5).

THEORY OF LITERATURE, by René Welleck and Austin Warren (Harcourt, Brace; $4.50).

THE WOUND DRESSER, by Walt Whitman (The Bodley Press; $3).

SELECTED POEMS OF WILLIAM CARLOS WILLIAMS. Edited by Randall Jarrell (New Directions; $1.50).

GENERAL

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF SOVIET RUSSIA, 1929-1941, by Max Beloff (Oxford University Press; Vol. I: 1929-1936, $3.75; Vol. II: 1936-1941, $5).

FEAR, WAR, AND THE BOMB, by P. M. S. Blackett (Whittlesey House; $3.50).

AMERICAN FREEDOM AND CATHOLIC POWER, by Paul Blanshard (Beacon Press; $3.50).

MODERN ARMS AND FREE MEN, by Vannevar Bush (Simon and Schuster; $3.50).

THE ECONOMICS OF JOHN MAYNARD KEYNES, by Dudley Dillard (Prentice-Hall; $5).

SOVIET ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SINCE 1917, by Maurice Dobb (International Publishers; $4).

THE ECONOMIC MIND IN AMERICAN CIVILIZATION, by Joseph Dorfman (Viking Press; Vols. I and II: 1606-1865, boxed, $10; Vol. III: 1865-1918, $6).

AN OUTLINE OF PSYCHOANALYSIS, by Sigmund Freud (W. W. Norton; $2).

BEHIND THE CURTAIN, by John Gunther (Harpers; $3).

HEREDITY EAST AND WEST, by Julian Huxley (Henry Schuman; $3).

THE CONDOR AND THE COW, by Christopher Isherwood (Random House; $3.50).

ON POWER: Its Nature and the History of Its Growth, by Bertrand de Jouvenel (Viking Press; $5).

INSIGHT AND OUTLOOK, by Arthur Koestler (Macmillan; $5).

EDUCATION FOR PEACE, by Herbert Read (Scribner's; $2.75).

HUMAN KNOWLEDGE: ITS SCOPE AND LIMITS, by Bertrand Russell (Simon and Schuster; $5).

ANTI-SEMITE AND JEW, by Jean-Paul Sartre (Schocken Books; $2.75).

THE VITAL CENTER, by Arthur Schlesinger Jr. (Houghton Mifflin; $3).

ITALY AND THE ITALIANS, by Count Carlo Sforza (E. P. Dutton; $3).

KILLERS OF THE DREAM, by Lillian Smith (W. W. Norton; $3).

PATTERNS OF ANTI-DEMOCRATIC THOUGHT, by David Spitz (Macmillan; $4.50).

LIVING WITH CRISIS, by Fritz Sternberg (John Day; $2.50).

THE AMERICAN SOLDIER. Vols. I and II: Adjustment During Army Life and Combat and Its Aftermath, by Samuel A. Stouffer and Associates; Vol. III: Experiments on Mass Communication, by Carl I. Hovland and Associates (Princeton University Press; *Vols. I and II, $7.50 each, $13.50 together*; Vol. III, $5).

MAGNA CARTA: Its Role in the Making of the English Constitution, 1300-1629, by Faith Thompson (University of Minnesota Press; $6.50).

CONSERVATISM REVISITED, by Peter Viereck (Scribner's; $2.50).

NEW COMPASS OF THE WORLD, edited by Weigert, Stefansson and Harrison (Macmillan; $5.50).

THE SHOW OF VIOLENCE, by Fredric Wertham (Doubleday; $3).

THEATRE: Purple Patch

ALL THAT Katharine Cornell's new vehicle, "That Lady," needed to make it a more satisfactory romantic drama was a robust literary treatment. Many of Maxwell Anderson's semi-historical verse plays have plots no more "reasonable" than that of Kate O'Brien's present excursion into sixteenth-century court intrigues.

It strikes me as foolishly sophisticated to say that we cannot enjoy "That Lady" because it deals with adultery, jealousy, vengeance, the sense of sin and everlasting desire. Some of the best literature in the world deals with little else. For my part, I find it easier to become interested in these themes than in the material of such entertainments as "Goodbye, My Fancy." When King Philip of Spain, in the course of tormenting the woman he professes to adore, is asked by her young son whether such behavior bespeaks love, and Philip answers in anguished spite, "Yes, this is love," I do not blush to admit that this somewhat operatic situation is dramatically and humanly sound. My only objection to "That Lady," I repeat, is that it is thinly written in the naturalistic mode, and what it wants is the exultant bloodiness of a D'Annunzio.

Years ago our forebears were hearty enough to take such plays in their stride. Even today there are many more people who hanker for an outright vehemence of feeling and expression than our timidly rational cosmopolite is willing to admit.

We haven't many actors left who can carry off the swagger, conceit and bravura emotionalism needed for this sort of drama. Guthrie McClintic's bent toward a plushy romanticism serves "That Lady" rather well. The settings and costumes are somewhat more Saks Fifth Avenue than Spanish (the characteristic of Spanish art being a certain severity—even in luxury), but considering the fact that the production is aimed at an opulent decorativeness rather than at a tigerish brilliance, a consistent and appropriate tone is sustained.

The cast is remarkably unified. Henry Daniell, as Philip, is especially successful in suggesting a waspish malevolence that is a combination of frustrated sex, wounded pride and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

brittle cunning. A good word might be said for almost all the others. It is a pity McClintic seems convinced that the grand romantic manner cannot be achieved without the use of vocal vibrato and strenuously regal diction.

Katharine Cornell is very much in her element in "That Lady." For Cornell hasn't a realistic bone in her body. Her very presence is the personification of the purple patch. Her emotions are picturesquely incandescent, delicately and darkly florid. Her voice, mask, movement are attuned to that image of the stage which has possessed the imagination of the well-to-do as well as of their counterparts in the gallery since 1850. I had a good time seeing her as "That Lady."

I didn't have a good time at the revival of Strindberg's "The Father." The production lacked a point of view; the acting was either conventional or weak. One cannot produce "The Father" today unless one does it as a savage melodrama or has a rather complex psychological approach to it. For example, one might say that "The Father" is about a virile and primarily emotional man of the nineteenth century who is thoroughly disturbed by the approaching intellectuality of the twentieth century. He flaunts his modern ideas and learning before his wife, who, being far more intelligent and realistic than her husband, uses these ideas in her conflict with him as an instrument to castrate and destroy him. But such an interpretation, if realizable in theatrical terms, would require far more time and study for its preparation than is possible to producers who are chiefly interested in cashing in on what promises to be a new vogue.

"The Closing Door," by Alexander Knox, is a psychoanalytic shiver show which employs material similar to that of such books as Wertham's *Dark Legend* to reasonably stimulating effect. The play is mostly nonsense, but it hardly pretends to be anything more. It tries to scare its audience and, in my case, it succeeded. My more learned and critical friends assure me that these things are better arranged in the movies—and I believe them—but for some reason, while films of this sort usually irritate me, "The Closing Door" was fun. This may have been due to Lee Strasberg's direction, which gave most of his characters a certain casual flexibility; to Paul Morison's setting, which had a quality of atmospheric resourcefulness; and to a few of the performances—notably that of Jo van Fleet—which struck some notes of truth. . . . In a Ray Bolger revue three years ago there was a sketch indicating that, following the success of "Oklahoma!," we were likely to get a series of musicals celebrating each of the 48 states. "Texas, L'il Darlin'" is like one of the shows in such a series.

HAROLD CLURMAN

THE BIBLE AND MODERN BELIEF

By LOUIS WALLIS

A remarkable new book about the Ancient Hebrews

¶ Scholars at leading universities are already acclaiming Mr. Wallis's new point of view, based upon a study of the Hebrew texts of the Scriptures and here made available in book form for the first time. Appealing strongly to thoughtful laymen, whether with or without church or synagogue affiliations, *The Bible and Modern Belief* shows that ancient Israel had no Bible until most of the nation had been overthrown and swept away (*i. e.*, "the Lost Tribes"). One tribe alone was left—Judah, from which is derived the name "Jew."

¶ The Bible was produced by unknown Jewish scribes, working in a literary and historic bottleneck after the great "Babylonian Exile." These ancient authors, living in an age when there was no scientific knowledge or understanding of human history, constructed a picture of Hebrew history as they thought it SHOULD have been during the long epoch before the Exile. This picture has been taken over into Jewish and Christian "orthodoxy"; but it clashes decisively with actual Hebrew history as reflected by the earlier, so-called "Ephraimite," sources carried along in the Bible itself.

¶ "I found the book fascinating," writes the Dean of McCormick Theological Seminary (Dr. Ovid R. Sellers). "It is particularly clear in pointing out the Jewish motivation on the part of the Pentateuchal Priestly writers in playing down the traditions which showed the priority of Ephraim. It brings into new highlight the earlier predominance of Ephraim and the manipulation of the literary material by the later scribes of Judah in discounting the north to the advantage of the south." And Dr. Sellers adds, "Carrying the book with me on a railroad journey, I became so absorbed that I took it into my berth and finished it at three in the morning."

$2.50

Order through your bookseller, or direct from

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS • College Station Box 6697 • Durham 5, North Carolina

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON THE AIR: Few and Far Between

A LOCAL radio station in New York, unaffiliated with any of the networks, is currently running a series of documentaries entitled "New Blood." It is an important program, but, merit aside, I hope that its title is brought to the attention of network executives dazzled by television.

The radio chains are, on the whole, still in the bog of routine thinking, humdrum programming and disinterest in new and imaginative ventures that the season showed at its start. Jack Gould, the perceptive radio-TV editor of the New York *Times*, has just looked at the after-dark picture and found that "by actual count, less than a dozen of the 115 sponsored evening programs on the four major [radio] networks are fresh attractions. . . . Of these, not one can lay any real claim to originality." I suggest that the coast-to-coast people listen to their local New York competitors, at least WNYC, WNEW and WMCA.

The "New Blood" program, on WMCA, had to be good for several reasons. WMCA is the station that used to broadcast "New World A' Coming," a documentary series planned to dramatize "the stories of men and events which affect the lives of all minorities in our democracy." When WMCA opened the fall season without "New World" it made a serious hole in the local air. "New Blood" is now broadcast as at least partial compensation and at "New World's" old time—Tuesdays at 9:30.

"New Blood" is an appeal for replenishment of the city's ill-supplied blood banks. Stanley H. Silverman, who writes the program, studied the subject for months, with results that are apparent on the air. The dramatic devices are too emotional, but the material is authentic. The Red Cross reports that after the first performance of "New Blood," donations in New York increased by 34 percent.

I'll pass quickly over my reference to WNYC, merely reminding—or informing—the networks that this station, owned by the city, puts on a weekly (Sunday at nine) program called "It's Your Life." Written by a leading documentarist, Ben Park, this show takes a tape recorder into hospitals, clinics, laboratories, and reports medical progress with fidelity and uncommon technical skill. WNYC's broadcasts are from recordings of the show as it originally ran in Chicago.

WNEW is giving us "A Radio History of the War," Sundays at five. The show is built from the recorded voices and sounds of World War II. That's been done before, notably—and jingoistically—on "March of Time's" recently concluded 26-week TV documentary based on Eisenhower's *Crusade in Europe*. WNEW's "Radio History" reconstructs the war more responsibly. Here, the sound of peace counts as well as the clash of arms. We are given not only the proof that Hitler's enemies were mighty in battle; we hear also Schacht's plea of "Not Guilty" at Nuremberg juxtaposed with a recent New York *Times* report on the failure of denazification in Bavaria. Tone and perspective are provided by quotations from Norman Corwin's memorable V-E Day broadcast, "On a Note of Triumph," wherein soldiers are heard asking: "What have we learned? Is it all going to happen again?"

The men responsible for "Radio History" are the station's program vice-president, Ted Cott; his assistant, Henry Morgenthau III; and director Jack Grogan. Jackson Beck is the excellent narrator. Cott, as producer and writer, has done a network-size job, and this is not the first time he has so distinguished WNEW. If the networks haven't imagination enough to pipe this show from WNEW, local stations in other cities might be persuaded to arrange for rebroadcasts by transcription. "A Radio History of the War" deserves a national audience.

One of the chains, NBC, has an excellent program right under its nose, but confines it solely to its New York outlet. Tuesday nights at 7:30—early enough not to interfere with "Baby Snooks," Bob Hope and "Fibber McGee"—WNBC presents "Everyman's Story." Under the auspices of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies, some of radio's top writers dramatize the meaning of and the need for psychiatry, medical research, expert child guidance and advanced methods of dealing with juvenile delinquency.

ABC, on the other hand, runs a program specializing in social service for the entire network. It is "Family Closeup," done in coöperation with the Family Service Association of America, and may be heard Sundays at four. The writer, Abram S. Ginnes provides in every script a mature examination of a personal, marital o child-parent situation facing professional caseworkers and their clients The acting is fine and the directing by Martin Andrews and Joe Graham is at radio's top level.

The sounds and voices of peace an war, similar to, and occasionally iden tical with, those being broadcast b WNEW's "Radio History," may b heard on Columbia's "I Can Hear I Now," which has gone into Volum

BOOKS

"I am grateful to you for granting me some insight into this fascinating world."—*Thomas Mann.*

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A YOGI

By

Paramhansa Yogananda

"Fascinating and clearly annotated study."—*Newsweek.* "A rare account."—*N. Y. Times.* "Refreshingly written."—*Tomorrow.* "Engrossing; a'literarity'."—*Grandy Syndicated Reviews.*

$3.50—500 pp., 32 pages of unusual photos
SELF-REALIZATION FELLOWSHIP
Dept. R, 3880 San Rafael Ave., Los Angeles 65, Calif.

POETICA EROTICA: 770 Pages, rare, curious, amatory verse! Unusual volume! Unexpurgated! Send $3.75. Satisfaction guaranteed. NATIONAL BOOK SERVICE, 3423 Douglas, Chicago.

ATHEIST BOOKS. 32-page catalogue free. Truth Seeker Co., 38 Park Row, N. Y. C. 8.

BUY U. S. SAVINGS BONDS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II. Again, as in the first volume of these recordings (reviewed here a year ago), Edward R. Murrow does the narration, tying together the felicitous fragments and making them significant for the ear (78 r.p.m., ten sides, $5.95; LP33-1/3 r.p.m., two sides, $4.85). SAUL CARSON

MOVIES: From Italy Again

A YOUNG FATHER, desperate for work, is offered a job on the condition that he provide himself with a bicycle. By giving the household linen in exchange, he and his wife reclaim his old machine from the pawnbroker, and he rides off in the early morning, proud for the first time in months. A few hours later, his bicycle is snatched by a band of thieves who vanish with mocking ease into the indifferent confusion of midday traffic. The unhappy man thereupon sets off with his seven-year-old son to search all Rome for the bicycle. Urgency forces them into bizarre encounters and undignified, frightening adventures; they have moments of wild hope, others of hysterical despair. They nearly succeed, but they completely fail. In the end, after a final agonizing and futile gesture, they take each other by the hand and turn toward home. That is Vittorio de Sica's "The Bicycle Thief."

One can pick with confidence the most thrilling Western, the most colorful musical of a given season, but de Sica's picture would only be limited by superlatives. If we can agree that it is a work of art, that, in the context of the screen, is rare enough praise.

Most movies, the good ones included, are anecdotal. De Sica's "Shoe Shine" was of that sort; so are the works of his great compatriot, Rossellini. When such pictures are admirable, it is because they demonstrate what "it was like" at a given moment, in a given place. But "The Bicycle Thief" is not just a report on postwar Rome; its tragedy is so simple that it must happen everywhere, all the time. De Sica can, and does, use the camera rapidly and nervously, rushing his story into its critical moments. But, again and again, he permits himself to seem beguiled by the beauty of light and form and weather; he stops to enjoy a joke; he is entranced by the chance and incongruous elbow-rubbing of a city. Only with a camera can you thus weave the thread of imagination straight into the fabric of reality.

And only with a camera can you produce dramatic art of a high order with amateurs. De Sica is one of the three or four modern directors who, instead of looking for actors, looks for people. In that way, he can demand casting perfection of himself, knowing that, since the camera is patient, it will sooner or later catch the revealing gesture, the unforgettable glance, from these untrained stars. But that is a cold way to look upon the superb cast of "The Bicycle Thief." De Sica has picked from the crowd the leads and the extras who will respond to his vision and technical instruction. Yet it is because they are people of uncommon subtlety and intelligence that they can do his bidding. Lamberto Maggiorani as the father and Enzo Staiola as his son perform the most beautiful duet in human relations that I have seen accomplished by an adult and a child. They not only reveal their separate roles; they produce the still more important personality of the two of them together. The rest of the cast is of the same order of excellence.

"The Bicycle Thief," finally, has mature judgment and a faith to give it stature. It expresses opinions, casually but incisively, on a variety of human traits, and throughout it asserts its conviction that the human spirit deserves to prevail. When the boy and his father are utterly defeated, they at last join hands; somehow the gesture makes the tragedy not only final but endurable. ROBERT HATCH

Printed by STEINBERG PRESS, INC., Morgan & Johnson Aves., Brooklyn 6, N. Y. 173

RESORTS

ARE YOU ON YOUR CHRISTMAS LIST?
Treat Yourself To A Splendid Winter Vacation!
WINTER SPORTS . . . . . .
. . PAINTING & CRAFTS . . . .
. . . . ENTERTAINMENT STAFF
OPENS DEC. 23
Easy To Reach by Bus, Train, or door-to-door Taxi Service
Write For Free Brochure
CHESTERS ZUNBARG
WOODBOURNE, N. Y. Tel. WOODBOURNE 1150

ARROWHEAD LODGE

Reserve Now
FOR CHRISTMAS HOLIDAY
Complete Social Staff
All Winter Sports
GR 7-1267 : ELLENVILLE 502
ELLENVILLE, NEW YORK

APPLES

CONNECTICUT APPLES. 24 delicious, big Cortlands, carefully selected and gift-packed, $2.50; 48 for $4.50. Postpaid 300 miles. ROBERT JOSEPHY, Blue Jay Orchards, Bethel, Conn.

AVAILABLE FREE!

FREE COPIES of James T. Farrell's, "On An Island in History," a report of his visit to the Spanish exiles. Write to the International Solidarity Committee, 303 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y.

DANCE

DANCE • SUN. 18th • 8:30
BROOKLYN YOUNG ADULT VOTERS
Avenue "P" & E. 18th Street Center
Admission: Two (2) copies of New Republic

GEIGER COUNTER

MAKE your next vacation trip profitable as well as enjoyable. Take a GEIGER COUNTER along. You may yet win that $10,000.00 for locating Uranium ores. $54.50 postpaid. Great Lakes Plastic Chemical Co., Leaf River 1, Illinois.

HANDWRITING ANALYSIS

SCIENTIFIC HANDWRITING analysis. Alfred Kanfer, 62 Leroy St., N. Y. C. Tel. WA 4-1575. Cooperating with doctors; psychologists, schools, firms, industries. Lessons. By appointment, or mail. Marital, educational, vocational, psychological problems. Fee $3.00.

LANGUAGES

LINGUAPHONE MAKES LANGUAGES EASY. At home learn to speak Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, French, German, Russian, by quick, easy Linguaphone Conversational method. Save time, work, money. Send for FREE book. Linguaphone Institute, 86 RCA Bldg., New York

LITERARY SERVICES

WRITERS—Efficient sales service for your books, short stories, articles, plays. Free booklet. Write today! Daniel S. Mead Literary Agency, 419 4th Ave., New York 16, N. Y.

PECANS

It's *pecan harvest time* in the heart of Texas. Ten pounds finest papershells prepaid for five dollars. (U. S. only.)
FABIS FARM BROWNWOOD, TEXAS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Forthcoming articles in

The NEW REPUBLIC

soon to appear

The British General Elections

a series of four articles

by NORMAN MacKENZIE

A member of the staff of the *New Statesman and Nation* (London) discusses in detail the issues upon which the coming elections in Great Britain will be fought, and answers the questions uppermost in the minds of Americans about the Labour Government's program and chance for success. The titles of the articles are:

I TWO ROADS FOR BRITAIN
II BRITAIN'S FARMS AND FOOD
III THE WELFARE STATE
IV BRITAIN'S FOREIGN POLICY

Other Features

STATE OF THE UNION SUPPLEMENT

¶ Inaugurated last year as a special issue, paralleling the President's annual message, from the liberal viewpoint, the supplement will be continued every year. Its success in 1948 was outstanding and many thousands of reprints were sold.

DISCRIMINATION THROUGHOUT THE U. S.

¶ A chart prepared by Paul Hartmann and Morton Puner, of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, showing in detail discrimination against minority groups as practised in each of the 48 states.

WHAT'S HAPPENING IN CALIFORNIA

¶ Things are boiling in the state of California, politically and otherwise. Under the pseudonym of "William Harding" a well-known citizen of that state reports on current developments.

In the
35TH ANNIVERSARY SERIES

¶ Scheduled for early publication are three of the ten articles in the series announced on the New Republic's 35th anniversary.

AMERICAN EDUCATION
by *William Heard Kilpatrick*

¶ An estimate of the progress made and to be made, by the dean of American authorities in education.

PROBLEMS OF POPULATION
by *Warren S. Thompson*

¶ A survey of current trends and their implications, by the Director of the Scripps Foundation for Research in Population Problems.

UNIONISM IN AMERICA
by *Philip Murray*

¶ The President of the Congress for Industrial Organizations looks back on labor's gains and forward to the program for tomorrow.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED